

REMARKS

An Office Action was mailed April 16, 2008. This response is timely. Any fee due with this paper, including any necessary extension fees, may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Summary

Claims 1-11 are pending, of which claim 1 is the only independent claims.

By the foregoing, claims 1-11 are cancelled and new claims 12-29 are presented. No new matter has been added.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to claim the subject matter distinctly. The claims are cancelled and new claims are presented.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. GB 1 457 136 to Waddington et al. (“GB ‘136”).

Applicant respectfully submits that GB ‘136 does not teach, disclose, or suggest the claimed slab formwork system.

Typically, slab formwork systems, including that described in GB ‘136 and those of the prior art described by the Applicant, include heads, main beams, cross-beams, and panels. The heads are referred to as “dropheads,” because when struck by a sledge hammer or the like, the heads become unlocked from the formwork and drop rather suddenly. Once the head has dropped, the beams and panels may be easily removed.

The presently claimed invention comprises dropheads in the form of support bolsters that in. As now claimed more clearly, each support bolster comprises

“a cradle having an inclined base” and

“each of the one end of the plurality of primary beams and one end of one of the plurality of cross-beams supported by the respective support bolster comprises a heel having a first lower surface that is inclined complementarily to the base of the respective one of cradles for wedging the one formwork panel towards the respective one of the vertical braces.”

GB ‘136 teaches an upper head 101 and a lower head 106 that lack any cradles having an include base and one end of the plurality of primary beams and one end of one of the plurality of cross-beams having the structure as claimed. Rather, the structure of GB ‘136 involves two plates that are provided without any includes surface and beams lacking any respective heel. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

Moreover, as for example, Fig. 6 of GB ‘136 makes clear two beams are framed together at different levels. However, in the presently claimed invention *“each of the support bolsters [is] mounted on top of a respective one of the plurality of vertical braces for supporting at least one end of a respective one of the plurality of primary beams and one of a respective cross-beam.”*

In other words, at least one of the primary beams and at least one of the cross-beams frame together at the same level.

Furthermore, GB ‘136 fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the groove as now claimed.

Specifically, the inclined bottom of the groove corresponds to the inclined support of the heels of the formwork panels. This permits the panels to wedged together and provides a tight fit as for example, in order to obtain the effect depicted in Figure 16, i.e., the creation of opposing forces attempting to butt join the panels.. GB ‘136 is completely silent with respect to any such feature. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection.

GB '136 also fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the claimed structure wherein means used for locking the head in an operative position and for releasing it when desiring to drop it. Such means are included in 20-23. Herein, the means for locking and releasing the bolster support and the means for guiding and fixing the vertical support to the vertical brace are novel and are not taught, disclosed or suggested by GB '136. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection for this reason alone.

All dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which they depend.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper, including any necessary extension fees, may be charged on Deposit Account 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

/Hassan A. Shakir/
Hassan A. Shakir
Reg. No. 53,922
(212) 940-6489

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304
Docket No.: HERR 20.657 (100700-00110)